

From: [Gerald Heston](#)
To: [Richard Fetzer](#)
Subject: Fw: Dimock follow
Date: 10/11/2012 01:24 PM

Hey, can you help answer these?

Gerald T. Heston, Chief
Eastern Response Branch (3HS31)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Phone: 215-814-3273
Fax: 215-814-3254

----- Forwarded by Gerald Heston/R3/USEPA/US on 10/11/2012 01:24 PM -----

From: Dennis Carney/R3/USEPA/US
To: Gerald Heston/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 10/11/2012 12:34 PM
Subject: Fw: Dimock follow

Jerry, can you follow-up on this with Terri?? Thanks, den.

----- Forwarded by Dennis Carney/R3/USEPA/US on 10/11/2012 12:20 PM -----

From: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US
To: "Dennis Carney" <Carney.Dennis@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 10/11/2012 11:17 AM
Subject: Fw: Dimock follow

Hi Dennis,

Can you help me with these questions? Thnx!

From: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Sent: 10/10/2012 08:37 PM AST
To: Terri-A White
Subject: RE: Dimock follow

Hi Terri,

A few more questions. (No deadline, although it would be helpful to have answers

by the end of the week.)

Can you direct me to a link for the radiological data spreadsheet? I can't find it on the EPA's website www.epa.gov/aboutepa/states/pa.html

Why were the radium test results not incorporated into the large spreadsheet "Validated data summary report for 61 households that were sampled"?

Were the people in Dimock who had their water wells tested provided with copies of the radiological data spreadsheet?

Thanks

Tom

Subject: Re: FW: Dimock follow

To: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

From: White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov

Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2012 13:15:41 -0400

Tom,

EPA did analyze for radium. There's a spreadsheet on the website that compiles all the analytical results for radiological parameters by home well. It includes results for radium 226 and radium 228. The actual title of the spreadsheet is "Dimock Radiological Data Weeks 1-5 and 1st Round Supplemental". -- Terri

Tom Wilber ---10/09/2012 03:07:38 PM---Hi Terri Were you able to get an answer re: question below?

From: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

To: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 10/09/2012 03:07 PM

Subject: FW: Dimock follow

Hi Terri

Were you able to get an answer re: question below?

Many thanks

Tom

Subject: Re: Dimock follow

From: White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov

Date: Wed, 5 Sep 2012 18:04:09 -0400

To: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Ok. I will try to get an answer to you Thursday or Friday.

From: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Sent: 09/05/2012 05:09 PM AST
To: Terri-A White
Subject: RE: Dimock follow

Hi Terri

I have this question from a reader:

It appears that the [analytical results](#) that the EPA did not test for radium in Dimock. Is there a reason for this?

I am not on a deadline, but I would like to address the reader's comments on my post when you can provide an answer.

(See full question below)

Thanks.

Tom

Tom---I have a question for you:

Re the EPA study: I read through the results when the EPA study came out and I was surprised that there were no levels listed for radium-226 or radium-228. It would appear (?) that the EPA did not test for radium, even though: 1) testing for radium seems to be a fairly standard thing to do (as I recall, radium levels are included in the routine testing done for our municipal water system here in Windsor, NY); and 2) radium is a possible contaminant at drilling sites because it can return to the surface via flowback from the gas well.

Perhaps there is a valid reason for this omission--I was wondering if you knew anything about this?

Subject: RE: Dimock follow
From: White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov
To: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Date: Wed, 5 Sep 2012 13:13:16 -0500

Hi Tom,

Sorry I couldn't get these responses to you sooner. -- Terri

Hi Terri,

I have questions re: EPA's investigation of Dimock groundwater.

[EPA's sampling of Dimock wells](#) shows hazardous levels of methane in six instances.

HW03z (28,000 ug/l)
HW12 (52,000)
HW25 (65,000)
HW26-P (38,000)
HW29 (77,000)
HW29z (62,000)

What steps have been taken to correct this?

EPA Response: It should be noted that five of the wells sampled, not six, presented a level of methane above the federal Office of Surface Mining's screening level of 28 parts per million. In the list of wells you've provided, HW29z is the same well as HW29. At the time of EPA's sampling, two of these homes were receiving alternate sources of drinking water from Cabot. All of these residents were advised of the methane results and the results were also shared with PADEP and the Susquehanna County Emergency Management Agency. All of these residents were already aware that their water contained levels of methane. Overall, we have found that the homeowners are aware of the existence of methane in their private wells and generally have installed vents to reduce the potential build-up of methane in their wells.

Pennsylvania DEP is continuing to address the issue of methane in Dimock wells under a consent order and agreement.

[ATSDR Record of Activity/Technical Assist \(UJD #: IBD7 Date: 12/28/2011\)](#) advises the EPA that "Additional characterization of the groundwater quality and a thorough review of any changes in concentration over time are indicated."

Has this been done?

EPA Response: Throughout EPA's sampling of residential well water in Dimock, which now has included five separate data releases, EPA has reviewed analytical results, and the particular circumstances at each residence, to make determinations on whether the situations presented a health concern, and if a further EPA action was warranted. The cumulative result from those efforts is a review which has shown that with only a few exceptions we did not find levels of hazardous substances in well water that could present a health concern. In those cases where the levels could present a health concern, we found that the residents have now or will have their own treatment systems that can reduce concentrations of contaminants to acceptable levels at the tap. No further characterization of groundwater is planned by EPA.

In the same document, the ATSDR has also recommended that "A full public health evaluation should be conducted on the data from the site area" and "evaluating the mixture for public health impacts using computational techniques or other suitable methods to evaluate the potential for synergistic actions" and "The cumulative concentration of all dissolved combustible gases should be considered to protect against the buildup of explosive atmospheres in all wells in the area."

Has this been done?

EPA Response: EPA's goal was to provide the Dimock community with complete, reliable information about the presence of contaminants in their drinking water and determine whether further action was warranted to protect public health. This sampling and evaluation did not demonstrate situations that present a health concern or give EPA a reason to take further action.

As for potential follow-up by ATSDR, please contact : Lora Werner at werner.lora@epa.gov

[attachment "graycol.gif" deleted by Gerald Heston/R3/USEPA/US]